



Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Discussed how in claim 11 it appears intrinsic that the bladder was longer than the inner fabric layer otherwise the bladder would not have been capable of being in sealable contact with the wearer's extremity. Additionally, noted that for the coated bladder to be in sealable contact (based upon the specification) it would appear that the bladder must have a glazed, smooth surface in the contact area with the wearer's extremity. Noted that in claim 15 if the bladder was placed over the first fabric member that it must be overlying the first fabric member and the upper portion of the bladder would extend beyond the same. Applicant's representative agreed that this was the correct relationship and agreed to the proposed examiner's amendment to correct the language..